

REMARKS

In light of the above amendatory matter and remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully solicited.

At paragraph 2 of the outstanding final office action dated November 30, 2006, the Examiner has objected to claims 2, 24, 43-47 and 49 because of a number of informalities. Applicants have amended these claims in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, except where other amendments rendered the objection to a particular informality moot, and therefore request that the objection to these claims be withdrawn.

At paragraph 4 of the outstanding office action, the Examiner has rejected claims 2-6, 11, 23-27, 32 and 43-49 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Baston (US Patent No. 4,809,189). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants have amended independent claims 43, 45 and 47 to recite what was seen as inherent in the claims as previously presented, that a downstream processing element requests processing from an upstream processing element, and that the upstream processing element only performs processing upon such a request. In this manner, intermediate buffers are not required, and indeed, a pull-type processing system is generated. Support for this inventive processing system is found in the application as originally filed at page 18, lines 4-22, with further examples of such processing at page 15, lines 5-17 and page 14, line 14 – page 15, line 2, as well as other portions of the specification as filed.

Thus, independent claim 43 now recites “wherein at least one of said plurality of processing elements requests processing from an upstream one of said plurality of processing elements so that upon said request, the upstream processing element performs said requested processing to provide required data to the at least one requesting processing element.” This

recitation makes it clear that it is upstream processing, performed in response to a downstream request, that provides the requested data. Independent claims 45 and 47 similarly recite “wherein at least one of said plurality of processing elements requests processing from an upstream one of said plurality of processing elements so that upon said request, the upstream processing element performs said requested processing to provide a result from the processing to the at least one of the plurality of processing elements requesting the processing.” This recitation provides for the request to be for upstream processing, the result thereof being passed downstream to the requestor.

In contrast, the portions of Baston relied upon by the Examiner show no such processing. Rather a request to retrieve data from a buffer is shown. Indeed, as noted by Applicants in their application as filed, and as additionally presented in at least, for example dependent claims 46 and 49, the present inventions allows for the omission of intermediate buffers as processing of upstream processing elements only takes place upon a request from a downstream processing element when it needs input information. Applicants would suggest that merely retrieving data from a storage location does not constitute processing as claimed in the present invention.

Additionally, Applicants have amended independent claims 45 and 47 to present elements that were considered to be inherent in the previously presented language, namely that the processing web is a graphical processing web, and that indeed, processing of the apparatus may be performed through the manipulation of a graphical representation of the processing taking place within the apparatus. Baston discloses no such graphical processing web.

Therefore, because Baston fails to teach each of the elements of independent claims 43, 45 and 47, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable. Furthermore, dependent claims 2-6, 11, 23-27, 32 and 44, 46 and 48-49 depend from one of independent claims 43, 45 and 47 and

are therefore allowable for this reason alone, and additionally as presenting independently patentable combinations in their own right. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-6, 11, 23-27, 32 and 43-49 under 35 USC 102(b) be withdrawn.

At paragraph 6 of the outstanding office action the Examiner has rejected claim 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baston in view of Shirai (US Patent No. 5,736,971). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 13 depends from independent claim 1 and is therefore allowable for this reason alone. Furthermore, the present invention is directed to a graphical representation of a processing web. Shirai describes a hardware system. Similar to the arguments made above with respect to independent claims 45 and 47, Applicants are at a loss to understand how mention of a hardware connector including pins (which is clearly well known) has any bearing on the use of the claimed pins in a graphical representation of the claimed processing web. Because Shirai fails to teach the claimed invention, and indeed fails to cure the defects noted above with respect to Baston, for this additional reason, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 103(a) be withdrawn.

At paragraph 7 of the outstanding office action the Examiner has particularly responded to Applicants previously presented arguments. In light of amendments to the claims noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as currently presented request upstream processing, not merely data. Applicants therefore request reconsideration of these comments by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

Statements appearing above in respect to the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinions of the undersigned attorney and, in the event the Examiner disagrees with any of such opinions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.


Applicants have made a diligent effort to place claims 2-6, 11, 13, 23-27, 32 and 43-49 in condition for allowance, and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner is unable to issue a Notice of Allowance at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any further outstanding issues.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Early and favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:


William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800